REMARKS

In response to the Office Action mailed on May 14, 2008, the Applicants respectfully request reconsideration in view of the following remarks. In the present application, claims 1, 3, 5, 7, 11, and 14 have been amended, claim 2 has been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer, and new claims 21-22 have been added. The claims have been amended to clarify that the XML schema file attached to the document and to clarify that inserting the selection of text into the other document includes receiving the selection of an XML node associated with the selection of text from an XML structure pane, the XML structure pane showing a markup language structure applied to the document, the markup language structure comprising a plurality of markup language nodes associated with portions of text in the document; and in response to a user input, moving the XML node to an XML structure pane showing a markup language structure applied to the other document to insert the XML markup and the selected text into the other document along with style and formatting properties defined in the markup language structure. Support for these amendments may be found at least in Figure 4 and on page 12, lines 21-23, page 14, lines 10-20, and on page 16, lines 11-30 in the Specification. No new matter has been added.

In the Office Action, claims 1-9, 11, and 14-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being anticipated by Easy Microsoft Word 2003 by Heidi Steele (published September 19, 2003, hereinafter "Steele") in view of Michaelides (U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2004/0181753 (filed March 10, 2003), hereinafter "Michaelides").

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-9, 11, and 14-19 are rejected as being unpatentable over Steele in view of Michaelides. Claim 2 has been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer rendering the rejection of this claim moot. The rejection of the remaining claims is respectfully traversed.

Amended claim 1 specifies a computer-implemented method of formatting a selection of text from a document as an Extensible Markup Language (XML) formatted selection such that the selection of text carries formatting properties particular to the selection of text for use in another document. The method includes receiving the selection of text in the document; identifying an XML markup specifying one or more formatting properties associated with the selection of text; applying the XML markup to the selection of text, wherein applying the XML markup to the selection of text includes applying an XML tag to the selection of text; associating

the XML markup with the selection of text for designating that the selection of text is formatted according to the XML markup independent of an other XML markup associated with the other document into which the selection of text is inserted; inserting the selection of text into the other document by: receiving the selection of an XML node associated with the selection of text from an XML structure pane, the XML structure pane showing a markup language structure applied to the document, the markup language structure comprising a plurality of markup language nodes associated with portions of text in the document; and in response to a user input, moving the XML node to an XML structure pane showing a markup language structure applied to the other document to insert the XML markup and the selected text into the other document along with style and formatting properties defined in the markup language structure; parsing the other document for formatting properties required for the other document after inserting the selection of text into the other document; avoiding a conflict between the XML markup associated with the selection of text and the other XML markup associated with the other document by causing the XML markup associated with the selection of text to be carried with the selection of text when the selection of text is inserted into the other document to maintain the application of the XML markup data to the selection of text in the other document independent of the other XML markup associated with the other document; and providing a framework for an annotation of the XML markup by associating the selection of text with at least one XML schema file attached to the document, the at least one schema file providing a definition of the XML markup applied to the selection of text and providing XML parsing application rules for understanding and using the XML tag.

It is respectfully submitted that the combination of Steele and Michaelides fails to teach, disclose, or suggest each of the features specified in amended claim 1. For example, the aforementioned combination fails to disclose that the XML schema file attached to the document or that inserting the selection of text into the other document includes receiving the selection of an XML node associated with the selection of text from an XML structure pane, the XML structure pane showing a markup language structure applied to the document, the markup language structure comprising a plurality of markup language nodes associated with portions of text in the document; and in response to a user input, moving the XML node to an XML structure pane showing a markup language structure applied to the other document to insert the

XML markup and the selected text into the other document along with style and formatting properties defined in the markup language structure.

Steele discusses a training manual for Microsoft Word 2003. Steele also discusses copy/paste functionality wherein pasted text keeps its original (source) formatting. See page 4 of the electronic book printout or page 52 of the original publication. As conceded in the Office Action, Steele fails to disclose XML documents. Steele also fails to disclose receiving the selection of an XML node associated with the selection of text from an XML structure pane and in response to a user input, moving the XML node to an XML structure pane showing a markup language structure applied to the other document to insert the XML markup and the selected text into the other document, as specified in amended claim 1. In contrast to the copy/paste mechanism discussed in Steele, amended claim 1 provides an alternative mechanism for inserting a selection of text into another document through the utilization of XML structure panes.

Michaelides fails to overcome Steele's deficiencies. Michaelides discusses a software adapter controlled by metadata. Michaelides also discusses copying and pasting XML. Michaelides further discusses the use of an XML template for selected text to be imported and associating an XML schema with the XML template. See Figure 31, paragraph 186, and Appendix I.

Michaelides however, fails to teach or suggest that the XML schema file attached to the document or that the use of XML structure panes for inserting the selection of text into the other document. In contrast, Michaelides discusses that an XML schema is associated (i.e., not attached) with an XML template. Michaelides is also silent with respect to the use of XML structure panes as an alternative to a copy/paste mechanism as a means of moving selected text from one document to another document to insert XML markup and selected text into the other document along with style and formatting properties defined in the markup language structure.

Based on the foregoing, amended claim 1 is allowable over the combination of Steele and Michaelides and the rejection of this claim should be withdrawn. Claims 3-9 depend from amended claim 1, and are thus allowable for at least the same reasons. Therefore, the rejection of these claims should also be withdrawn. Amended independent claims 11 and 14 specify similar features as amended claim 1 and thus are allowable over the combination of Steele and

Michaelides for at least the same reasons. Therefore, the rejection of these claims should be also withdrawn. Claims 15-19 depend from amended claim 14, and are thus allowable for at least the same reasons. Therefore, the rejection of these claims should also be withdrawn.

New Claims

New claims 21-22 specify validating the XML markup and the associated selection of text against the at least one XML schema file as the XML markup and the associated selection of text is entered into the document, and generating an error message to alert a user of at least one of an invalid XML markup and an invalid text string. Support for these claims may be found on at least page 13, lines 4-21 in the Specification. New claims 21-22 depend from amended independent claims 1 and 14 and thus are allowable over the combination of Michaelides and Steele for at least the same reasons discussed above with respect to amended claims 1 and 14. In addition, neither Michaelides nor Steele, alone or in combination, appear to teach, disclose, or suggest the validation of XML markup and associated selected text against a schema file, and generating an error message alerting a user of an invalid XML markup or text string, as specified in claims 21-22. Therefore, these claims are also allowable over both Michaelides and Steele for at least the foregoing additional reasons.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, this application is now in condition for allowance. A notice to this effect is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes, after this amendment, that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to call the Applicants' attorney at the number listed below.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 13-2725.

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.
P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-0903
(404) 954-5064

Date: October 16, 2008

/Alton Hornsby III/
Alton Hornsby III

27488
PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE